

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 339

JC 820 055

AUTHOR Baker, Ronald E.; Ostertag, Bruce A.
TITLE Community College Handicapped Student Programs and
Advisory Committees.
PUB DATE [81]
NOTE 16p.
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Advisory Committees; *College Planning; *Community
Colleges; Educational Legislation; *Group Activities;
*Group Membership; Group Structure; Participant
Characteristics; Program Development; School
Community Relationship; *Special Education; Special
Programs; State Surveys; Statewide Planning; Student
Personnel Services; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

In 1977, the State Board of Governors adopted legislation mandating the establishment of advisory committees for handicapped student programs and services in California community colleges. In fall 1980, a statewide survey was conducted to investigate the current operational structure and activities of these committees. Program coordinators at 106 California community colleges were asked to provide information on their characteristics; the characteristics of advisory committee members; the organizational structure of the committees; present and past emphases in committee activities; and committee problems, effectiveness, and functions. Selected findings, based on responses from 83 colleges, include the following: (1) respondents worked in colleges with an average enrollment of 10,995 students serving an average of 337 handicapped students; (2) while faculty and staff composed the largest group of committee members, other groups were adequately represented; (3) 71.1% of the committees lacked written by-laws; (4) during 1980-81, committee activities focused primarily on improving program operations and curriculum and instruction; and (5) major problems were identified as lack of a clearly defined committee role, member apathy, and lack of attendance. Recommendations, based on these and other findings, called for a clearer definition of committee roles, chairpersons from outside the college staff, greater community representation, more convenient meeting times, training sessions for new and continuing members, and statewide guidelines. (HB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED212339

COMMUNITY COLLEGE HANDICAPPED
STUDENT PROGRAMS AND ADVISORY
COMMITTEES

Ronald E. Baker, Ed.D.
Bruce A. Ostertag, Ed.D.

Mira Costa College
California State University, Sacramento

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Bruce A. Ostertag

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

Jc820055

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the current operational structure and activities of mandatory citizen advisory committees for Handicapped Student Programs and Services in the public community colleges in California.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE HANDICAPPED
STUDENT PROGRAMS AND ADVISORY
COMMITTEES

In 1980, the most recent estimate indicated that more than a million parents and other citizens belonged to some 60,000 school advisory committees which had been formed in the last 10 years. The largest number of these committees were mandated by federal legislation aimed at special target groups such as low income, bilingual, and handicapped students (Davies, 1980). The intent of this article was to investigate advisory committees for such a target group. Specifically, advisory committees in California Community Colleges for handicapped students was explored.

In the California Community Colleges, the mandate for the establishment of advisory committees for handicapped student programs and services was initiated in 1977 by the State Board of Governors. The law they adopted stated simply that an advisory committee must be established and that the committee must be composed of representatives determined by program needs. The law did not indicate any additional requirements for the operations of advisory committees and therefore delegated any operational decisions to the program coordinator. Subsequently, there has been no operative system designed to ensure quality in the organizational structure or activities of the advisory committees.

METHOD

The purpose of this study was to investigate the current operational structure and activities of mandatory citizen advisory committees for Handi-

capped Student Programs and Services in the public community colleges in California. Various research questions were developed and were used to direct this research. A statewide survey was mailed in fall, 1980, to 106 program coordinators working at the various public community colleges. Information was received from 88 or 83.0 percent of the colleges. Multi-college districts which operate a district-wide advisory committee were eliminated from the sample, leaving 83 valid cases, or 78.3 percent, of the 106 California Community colleges. The following is a brief summary of the major areas of the findings.

RESULTS

Respondent Characteristics. Most of the respondents had the job title of program coordinator or enabler and had worked in that position on an average of 4.75 years, and were assigned to the Handicapped Student Programs and Services an average of 12.10 years in education.

The respondents worked in community colleges with an average size of 10,995 students and served an average of 337 handicapped students. The majority of the community colleges served communities which were either urban and suburban.

Characteristics of Advisory Committee Members. Individuals representing the college staff or faculty composed the largest group of advisory committee membership. In rank order, other representatives included private non-profit agencies, other educational institutions, students, state and federal agencies, business and industry, consumer groups for the handicapped, parents, and members of the general public. The membership of the advisory committees represented the communities they served.

The majority of the advisory committee members were appointed by college personnel. In 7.2 percent of the committees, members were selected with advisory committee input. Generally, there were no written criteria for the selection of committee members. On the average, advisory committee members served 2.5 year terms and meeting attendance averaged 75.21 percent of the members. Most of the committee work was reported to be done by the same few members, and the members generally did not divide into different factions on most issues. Members were also untrained for their committee role.

Organizational Structure of Existing Advisory Committees. Findings indicated that there were some advisory committees organized for each disability group but the majority of the colleges operated a total program advisory committee. Very few colleges organized specific advisory committees for individual groups. The majority of the respondents disagreed with the statement that an advisory committee for each disability group should be organized at each college.

In the total sample, the average size of each of the different types of advisory committees ranged from 11.50 to 14.88 members. Some 68.7 percent of the respondents reported that they had a written statement or purpose. Only 37.3 percent of the respondents had written reporting procedures. Some 45.8 percent of the advisory committee recommendations were submitted directly to the program coordinator. Seventy percent of the respondents indicated that the advisory committee should operate independently of the college Board of Governors.

Some 71.1 percent of the committees did not have written by-laws. There were mixed opinions about the need for written by-laws with 40.9 percent

indicating that a committee should not have by-laws, and 19.3 percent were undecided about the issue.

Almost all advisory committees had meeting agendas and 69.9 percent of the agendas were prepared by either the program coordinator or by the program staff and coordinator. Only 19.2 percent of the agenda preparation involved advisory committee members. In 84.4 percent of the committees, the recordkeeping activities were performed by college personnel. In 4.8 percent of the committees, the recordkeeping activities were performed by college personnel. In 4.8 percent of the committees, the recordkeeping activities were performed by a committee member.

Respondents were asked to indicate which person had the most power or influence in the committee. The program coordinator had the most power-influence with the committee chairperson being the next most influential person in the group. Respondents were asked to indicate which person performed the activities of committee chairperson, and in 63.9 percent of the committees, the program coordinator acted as the committee chairperson. In 24.1 percent of the committees, the chairperson was chosen from the committee members. Some 22.9 percent of the advisory committee chairpersons were elected, 19.3 percent volunteered for the job, and 41.0 percent were appointed. Some 64.7 percent of the appointed chairpersons were self-appointed, and 11.8 percent were appointed by the superintendent/president. Interestingly, when asked if the advisory committee should be controlled by the program coordinator, 27.7 percent agreed with the statement, 40.9 percent disagreed with the statement, and 21.7 percent were undecided.

When looking at committee decisions, 50.6 percent of the respondents

felt that advisory committee members should not enforce all committee decisions, and 84 percent felt that reports from dissenting members should be allowed. When making committee decisions, 60.2 percent of the committees used a simple majority vote.

Actual Operations of the Advisory Committees. Some 21.7 percent of the responding colleges did not hold an advisory committee meeting during the 1979-80 point school year. The remaining colleges held 2.23 meetings per year. Sixty-two point seven percent of the colleges which operated a committee held from one to three meetings per year lasting on an average of 2.14 hours in length. The majority of the meetings were held in the early and late afternoon with 24.1 percent being held in the mornings or at noon. Only 4.8 percent of the committees held meetings at night. Almost all of the committees met on campus. Only 28.9 percent of the colleges operated subcommittees.

Respondents were asked their opinions as to whether advisory committees should meet more often. Twenty point five percent felt the committees should meet more often. Thirty-seven point three percent felt that they should not meet more often and 30.5 percent were undecided. Six percent of the respondents felt that advisory committees should not continue to operate with the majority of the remaining respondents favoring the continuation of advisory committees.

Issues and Activities of Advisory Committees. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents felt that the advisory committees should deal with short range specific purpose issues, and that new items not on the agenda should be open to discussion by the committee. The majority of the agenda items dealt with during the 1979-80 school year centered around program improvement

in such areas as student services, program operations, curriculum content and instruction, and architectural barriers. Other issues dealt with the community public relations, community public relations, community resource coordination, committee organization, legal issues, program evaluation, and student activities. Interestingly, very few committees dealt with their own committee operations or organizations. Issues anticipated for the 1980-81 school year showed a slight shift of emphasis away from items dealing with student services and architectural barriers to a shift toward more items dealing with program operations and curriculum and instruction.

Respondents indicated that advisory committees took enough time to complete tasks well and usually met deadlines. Respondents also felt that reasonable deadlines were assigned to committees.

Some 69.9 percent of the colleges did not have a formal training program for advisory committee members, however, 47.0 percent of the respondents felt that there should be formal training programs. Interestingly, 85.6 percent of the respondents felt that advisory committee members should be aware of the college financial situation.

Problems of Advisory Committees. The major problems reported by the respondents were members' role definition, member apathy, members' attendance at scheduled meetings, members' communications, members' powerless feelings, members dividing into factions of control, members' lack of specific program knowledge, and members feeling too much time was required. Thirty-six percent of the respondents did not list any problems in their advisory committees.

Effectiveness of Advisory Committees. Some 48.2 percent of the respondents indicated that advisory committees were given little respect or power, but almost all of the respondents felt that advisory committees im-

prove school and community relations. Respondents reported that members should not always expect school officials to accept all of their recommendations, however, 78.3 percent of the respondents indicated that school officials usually or always accepted advisory committee recommendations. Respondents had mixed opinions as to whether advisory committee recommendations should be implemented by school officials, some 44.4 percent indicated that school officials should implement committee recommendations, 21.7 percent indicated they should not implement committee recommendations, and 21.7 percent were undecided on the issue.

The advisory committees had the most influence on the handicapped program staff, and next, on the special education teaching faculty. They had little influence on the College Board of Governors.

Opinions of Respondents. The strongest opinion expressed by the respondents concerned the statements that (1) advisory committee members should be aware of the college's financial situation, (2) meetings should be open to discussion about new issues not included on the agenda, (3) reports from dissenting members should be permitted, (4) committees should operate independently of the Board of Governors, and (5) committees should continue to operate. The majority of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with these statements.

Respondents were most divided on the following statements that (1) advisory committees should deal with short range specific purpose issues, (2) committee recommendations should be implemented by school officials, (3) committees should have a formal training program for members, and (4) committees should have written by-laws. The majority of the members agreed or were undecided about the statements.

Respondents were also more divided on the following statements that (1) advisory committees should be controlled by the program coordinator, (2) committees should meet more often, (3) committee members should endorse all committee decisions, (4) committees for each disability group served should be organized at each college, and (5) advisory committee members should expect school officials to accept all of their recommendations. The majority of the respondents disagreed or were undecided with these statements.

DISCUSSION

The majority of the committees were total program advisory committees with very little written organizational structure. The program coordinators appeared to completely control the committees and were responsible for preparing meeting agendas, selecting members, recordkeeping activities, and chairing committee meetings. The lack of specific state guidelines may have encouraged this type of organizational structure.

The fact that 21.7 percent of the respondents did not operate an advisory committee during the 1979-80 school year indicated a lack of interest in advisory committees by those respondents. The average size of the committees was similar to findings of other studies. Since the committees were controlled by the program coordinator, day-time meetings during working hours and only two meetings held per year were the results.

Most of the committees operated without written membership criteria and most of the members were chosen by the program coordinator or college staff. Consequently, the largest single group represented on the committee was the college staff and faculty. However, adequate representation of other groups and individuals did exist in the committee, which confirms that program coordinators were following the state guidelines on suggested

committee membership.

The two major problems of the advisory committee centered around the members' role definition and member apathy. Finding a suitable meeting time was another problem reported by the respondents along with the problem of members' communication, members' feeling powerless, members' dividing into factions of control, members' lacking of knowledge, and members' feeling that too much time was required.

Advisory committees appeared to be relatively effective at the respective community college campuses since it was reported that committee recommendations were usually accepted by school officials. Advisory committees also appeared to impact the handicapped program staff and the special education faculty more than other groups on campus. Beyond this direct program impact, advisory committees had little effect on the rest of the campus as a whole and almost no impact on the college Board of Governors.

The issues which advisory committees dealt with during 1979-80 centered around services provided to the student. The shift in 1980-81 was toward improving program operations and the curriculum and instruction. Programs and services for the handicapped have seen a steady rise in the amount of services and sophistication of programs since the early days of the handicapped programs. Similarly, the shifts in advisory committee agenda items have demonstrated this change. For example, once architectural barriers were identified and eliminated, for further discussion was needed. In 1979-80, 9.2 percent of the agenda items dealt with architectural barriers and only 7.6 percent of those agenda items were anticipated for 1980-81. Similarly, items dealing with the delivery of student services went from 28.5 percent of the agenda items in 1979-80 to 25.6 percent of the antici-

pated agenda items for 1980-81. To repeat, once services were implemented, less discussion was needed.

On the other hand, items which dealt with program operations went from 20.9 percent of the agenda items in 1979-80 to 25.2 percent of the anticipated agenda items for 1980-81 and items which dealt with curriculum and instruction went from 19.7 percent of the agenda items in 1979-80 to 23.1 percent of the anticipated items for 1980-81. These shifts indicated that programs now provide basic services and the emphasis of advisory committees has moved toward improving the quality and sophistication of the services and the academic programs.

Respondents generally favored the continuation of advisory committees, separate from the formal Board, organized on an informal basis which allowed for the discussion of new issues not on agenda, and which dealt with short range specific purpose issues. Respondents did not desire more advisory committee meetings and did not want separate committees for each disability group. Respondents indicated that the program coordinator should not control the advisory committee. Interestingly, the majority of the committees were controlled by the program coordinator.

On the issue of committee recommendations, the respondents expressed the opinion that recommendations should be implemented by school officials but indicated that committee members should not expect school officials to accept all of their recommendations. The respondents also indicated that committee members should not endorse all committee decisions, and that reports from dissenting members should be permitted.

Based upon the above findings, the authors would like to make the following recommendations. We believe that instituting of these ideas will

lead to successful functioning of advisory committees involved with community college handicapped programs and services.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1.) Advisory committees for Handicapped Student Programs and Services should be better organized with more written directives such as a statement of purpose, by-laws, membership criteria, and reporting procedures. This study found that advisory committees lacked written directives.

2.) Advisory committees for Handicapped Student Programs and Services should have chairpersons chosen from outside the college staff. A more effective model of advisory committees structure involved a committee chairperson chosen from the community. The type and quality of advice produced by an advisory committee reflected the community which the college was serving when the chairperson was chosen from the community.

3.) Individuals responsible for membership selecting should attempt to have a better balance of members representing the community. The findings of this study found that the largest groups of representatives were from the community. Larger percentages of community representations could produce a more community responsive committee.

4.) Holding meetings during evening hours, and holding luncheon meetings at the college expense should also be explored as a means of increasing attendance. This study found that meetings were held at the educators' convenience and not at the convenience of community members.

5.) Training sessions for new and continuing advisory committee members should be developed. Very few existing committees operated formal training programs. Many of the coordinators' expressed that they would like their members to be aware of the college financial situation and to make

appropriate recommendations, however, they fail to train their members. Topics could include members' responsibilities, reporting procedures, and college and program operations.

6.) The California Association of Post-Secondary Educators of the Disabled (CAPED) should establish advisory committee standards which could be used as guidance to members working with advisory committees.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. Handicapped Program Regulations. Board of Governors Action No. 77206, February, 1977.
- California Administrative Code, Title V, Division 7, Part 6, Chapter 1, Handicapped Programs and Services, Section 56000 et sec. Sacramento: State Department of Education.
- _____. "Administrations and Advisory Councils: Partnership or Shotgun Marriage?" NASSP Bulletin, 64:62-66, January, 1980.
- Dyste, Ronald E., Robert F. Howard, David A. Paddarell. "Report to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. . . on Handicapped Students Programs and Services." Sacramento: Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, July 24, 1980 (Mimeographed).
- Marsee, Stuart E. The Community in Community College. Torrance: El Camino College, 1978, ED 151 053.
- Smith, Ronald E. "California Community Colleges Educational Programs for the Handicapped." Norwalk: Cerritos College, May, 1973 (Mimeographed).
- _____. Operational Guidelines: Programs for the Handicapped. Sacramento: Office of the Chancellor, California Community Colleges, 1977.
- Spencer, Janet T. and Others. Elementary Statistics. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1976.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. "Nondiscrimination on Basis of Handicap." Federal Register, Vol. 42, No. 86, May 4, 1977.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. "Implementation of Executive Order 11919." Federal Register, Vol. 43, No. 9, January 13, 1978.
- Zerchykov, Ross and Don Davies. Leading the Way: State Mandates for School Advisory Councils in California, Florida and South Carolina. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1980.
- Zerchykov, Ross. "Minimum State Requirements Become Maximum Local Performance." Citizen Action in Education, 7:8-94, November, 1980.
- Zoglin, Mary Lou. Power and Politics in the Community College. Palm Springs, California: ETC Publications, 1976.

MAR 19 1982

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
96 Powell Library Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024